Not so the Kazakhs. Among the Kazakhs and related societies, the role of maternal affection is simply not to be found, in the ethnographies or in the native literature. There are autobiographies of Kazakhs, among them that of the novelist Sabit Mukanov, and biographies of Kazakhs by Kazakhs. Nowhere does the theme of a mother's love for her son, nor of the son's affection for his mother, appear. These autobiographies and novels are products of the Soviet era, but there is nothing in the Soviet pattern which rules out the theme of mother love. Similarly, in collections of poems and songs of both the Soviet and the prerevolutionary eras, the idea of mother love rarely appears. These poems and songs celebrate the deeds of past heroes, or the love of a youth for a girl; girl's songs praise the bravery and handsomeness of the lover. The mother is simply missing. If by chance she should appear, it is only as one of a series of family members.

In the Kazakh language, the term of endearment for the mother is not centered on the mother alone; it designates at the same time mother, elder sister, paternal aunt. This could be taken as a symbol of the great force of mother love, so great that it has become generalized to all other closely related elder females. But this possibility must be ruled out in view of the almost complete silence which the Kazakhs maintain regarding the mother and the mother theme.

The novelist Mukhtar Auezov has written two novels about the 19th century Kazakh poet, Abai Kunanbaev. The general theme concerns the formation of the character of this 19th century Kazakh intellectual who turned to Russia for guidance (Abai is the translator into Kazakh of Pushkin's Eugene Onegin). Abai's life is presented in a literary pattern acceptable to the political line of the Soviet Union: the pattern of the daring youth who breaks with the past, overcoming the tyranny of the traditional life and storming toward the new. This theme is popular with the Soviet leadership, for it contains the notion of the friendship of the peoples of the Soviet Union—under the aegis of the Great Russians. Abai's father is depicted as a monster of feudal oppression, and Abai is shown in stern revolt against him. Abai's mother appears briefly as part of a dim gallery of forces which are generally passive and favorably disposed toward the hero: the grandmother, the mother, a poetess of the era, Abai's beloved. The beloved is represented as lovable, the poetess as a beautiful singer, and the grandmother as a woman of wisdom—which is in general a male trait. The mother plays a brief, positive role in Abai's youth and then disappears from the novel. She herself is colorless, and the emotion is centered around the grandmother, a figure not of love but of wisdom.[1]

The absence of the mother role and mother love is true of other domains of Kazakh family life and social life generally. There is nothing that counterbalances the father-son orientation of the family and the society. Woman's status, however high it may rise, is inferior to that of the male. As a young girl, the steppe daughter is a "non-person"; she counts for little. She may be betrothed in infancy, in which case

[1]Auezov (3), 1949. See also Krader's doctoral dissertation (78), 1953, chapter 6. Winner (128) corroborates this analysis of the literary evidence.

648 668 is little evidence of contact between the Alash-Orda and the Basmachi, at least at the beginning of the 1920's. But of late the various movements have become combined in the minds of the survivors, and this integration is attributed by them to the past of 30 years ago. Among the most active in this connection is Zeki Walidi Togan, a Turkic historian, now in Turkey, and once a leader in these movements.

The Kazakh revivalists were actively sought out and suppressed by the Soviet regime in the late twenties and early thirties. However, when the USSR was attacked by Germany, Moscow sought to use all tactics at its disposal to encourage the peoples in the Soviet Union to resist Hitler. One such tactic was the encouragement of local cultural traditions among the various peoples, the creation of a native pride which they might fight to preserve. The Kazakhs were encouraged to develop their own history, with the sole proviso that the Soviet era be depicted as the culminating point in their development. This policy was related to the previously cited theory which viewed Tsarism as the lesser evil to Turkestan's being swallowed up by the English, the Germans, or the Chinese. The Soviet policy during World War II produced a great revival of Kazakh in-group feeling, centered around the glorification of Kazakh heroes of the past. Since the Kazakhs had developed their own historical studies [814] during the past century, a process which was accelerated in the Soviet period, the movement to popularize Kazakh heroes and their deeds was turned over to the historians.

Khan Kenesary Kasymov was much written about, discussed, and praised; his name became a popular byword among the Kazakhs in the 1940's, after a century of oblivion. One Kazakh historian, Gabidullah Bekmakhanov, wrote a full-length history of Kenesary's activities against the Russians; this work, prepared as a doctoral dissertation in 1943, was published in 1947 in Alma-Ata. An official history of Kazakhstan written by Abdykalykov, a Kazakh, and the nominal co-author Pankratova (who since has become president of the Historical Section of the All-Union Academy of Sciences) likewise assigned a great and positive historical role to Kenesary. Other pronouncements of the period were less temperate; Sharipov, a Kazakh historian writing in 1949, pictured Kenesary as the prime national liberator. Two professors of history, Ismailov and Djumaliev, took the same line, the latter in a history book written for Kazakh school children.

The movement sought other heroes in the Kazakh past, especially those who had been active against the Russians: Batyr Srym was presented as a heroic figure by his official biographer, Viatkin; the historical significance of Isatai Taimanov, a rebel or liberator of the middle of the 19th century, was advanced by one Shakhmatov; an obscure figure who led a revolt among the Kazakhs of the Syr-Darya against the Russians, Batyr Djankhodji Nurmuhammed, was described by T. Shoinbaev.

The historical tradition which developed was clearly Kazakh, the result of the Kazakhs' search for a native expression of their own, the recreation of a tradition which had lain dormant for several decades.

668 Kazakh nativism as a broad movement with a politico-religious orientation has taken the form of a many-faceted cultural revival. The

8:Krader & Wayne E-4 (no date) 1955 RQ2 Kazak RQ2

one cannot escape the fact that the various societies and peoples of the Soviet Union are being reshaped and remolded with the image of Soviet culture as the target. The political life is that of Moscow's creation, as is the economic; the religious is that which is permitted by the central regime. The language of each nationality—as it is taught in the schools, or written in the newspapers—is the one which Moscow has decided upon. The various nationalities themselves have been regrouped, often arbitrarily, for the purpose of greater convenience of administration by Moscow.

The grandiose and sweeping nature of the changes planned under Soviet nationality policy is sufficient to assure that major change is in fact taking place. A question exists only in regard to the direction such change will take and how far it will deviate from the plan. Whatever the direction of change, the cost in dislocation and suffering among the minority peoples will remain enormous.

KAZAKH ART AND LETTERS

In the chapter dealing with Kazakh religion and religious developments, a discussion of current trends in history writing in Central Asia was included to illustrate the rise of nativism, the idealization of native culture. While the connection between historiography and religion is not immediately apparent, there is an underlying relationship. This relationship may be more easily traced when one is applying the methods of cultural anthropology, as was the case in the discussion of religion. If one starts with the premise that the various aspects of a people's life are an interrelated whole, it follows that the religious life bears upon the economic, the economic on the religious, the political on the artistic. The concept of nativism has been used as a means of synthesizing the different cultural trends in Kazakhstan. The significance of the glorification of their past by native Kazakh historians during the Soviet era is clear. The historical traditions of the Kazakhs are important to them; around those traditions they were building in the 1940's the nucleus of an independent revival of Kazakh culture. The Soviets regarded this as dangerous, and the participants were either purged or warned away from the theme.

This sort of cultural revival is a type of nativism known in many parts of the world; the common feature such revivals share is a distinctive religious tone. But it is not the old religion which is being revived among the Kazakhs; rather, the old traditions are being treated in a religious fashion. These traditions become a religion, and the renewed interest in them a religious revival. The movement among the Kazakhs to revive the traditions of the past immediately became involved in politics. The Russian term kultura usually implies such political ramifications. In this sense there is a cultural politics in the Soviet Union.

The cultural taste of the regime in Moscow serves as a model for the rest of the empire. This cultural taste includes in part that which is pleasing to the political leaders of the Soviet Union. It includes

53
177
[341] also what Moscow deems proper to see developing in the provinces. The architecture which is encouraged in Moscow is only part of the climate of cultural taste. Public buildings in Alma-Ata reflect both Russian 19th century Baroque and Central Asiatic architectural themes: Russian columns and massiveness, Central Asiatic arches and blue tile ornament. Soviet architects have taken basic ideas from Russian contemporary architecture and to them added local ideas. Whether these hybrids are suited to local conditions of weather, availability of materials, and so forth, is another matter.

"Nationalist in form, socialist in content" was a much-publicized slogan 20 years ago; but it is seldom mentioned today. One can easily discuss Soviet art or architecture without reference to this formula; it no longer has even a covert role to play. The modern slogan might read "Soviet in basic form, local style in ornament."

668 This trend is evident in other forms of expression as well. Let us consider the topic of heroes. In the historical tradition, the Kazakh revival was centered around heroes of the past such as Kenesary Kasymov. This is not in keeping with the sense of heroism which the Kremlin seeks to instill in the Kazakhs. During the 1920's and 1930's, Moscow permitted only such heroes as Frunze and Chapayev, who fought the civil war in the steppes of Central Asia. To these has been added the figure of Amangeldy, a Kazakh who was an early member of the Bolshevik party. The revival of 19th century Kazakh heroes in the 1940's took place under conditions of wartime desperation. Moscow was anxious to sound any note that might awaken the feelings of the Kazakhs, to let any theme be pursued. The Soviets sought to show that the Russian revolutionaries in fighting the Tsars had advanced the same cause as had Kenesary, and that the Kazakhs and the Bolsheviks should therefore make common cause.

During World War II the possible selection of heroes expanded to include not only military and political leaders of the past, but literary
[538] and scientific figures as well. Abai Kunanbaev, a 19th century Kazakh poet, has been much publicized in novels, plays, movies, and literary essays. He is acceptable to the Russians, for he was the translator into Kazakh of Russian poetry. Moreover, he was a friend of anti-Tsarist Russians, among them Chernyshevsky, a novelist and revolutionary exile. Chokan Valikhanov, although a Kazakh, was an officer of the Tsars, educated in St. Petersburg University, a member of
[814] leading artistic and intellectual circles, and author of historical and ethnographic notes on the Kazakh past. He has been no less honored than Abai or Kenesary. Altynsarin, perhaps the greatest Kazakh intellectual, an educator, publicist, editor, ethnographer, and creator of a Kazakh alphabet, was likewise given a pre-eminent place in the Kazakh revival.

[214] In the 1940's a Kazakh literary and artistic journal Adabiet zhane
[538] iskusstvo ("Literature and Art") was started. Adabiet is a Kazakh word meaning literature, iskusstvo a Russian word meaning art; the title thus expresses the mixed character of contemporary Kazakh arts and literature. It can hardly be said that the journal is a success. It has been attacked for deviations from the political line, as might have been

53 1991

The form is also imposed by Moscow, whether it concerns the introduction of the novel form in literature or the imitation of the massive architectural style in public buildings. Only the ornament and embellishment are locally derived.

HISTORY

G68 [814]

The same lines of criticism which the Soviets have directed at Kazakh literature and art have been applied to the writing of Kazakh history. The revival of Kazakh historical traditions during World War II developed into a great movement involving many Kazakh historians and writers. In 1950, Pravda published an editorial denouncing the entire movement, choosing for its main target the luckless Bekmakhanov, for his history of the Kenesary movement.[1] The Kazakh Party and press were slow in following the line laid down in Pravda. Only after a four-month delay did Kazakhstanskaia Pravda take up the attack, printing a policy statement from the Central Committee of the Kazakh Party, which commented on the Pravda editorial of the previous December and called for a formal Party hearing on the subject. This hearing took place in April and was reported in Kazakhstanskaia Pravda of 24 April 1951, in an article giving the general Party findings and those of the Party primary organization of the Kazakh Pedagogic Institute. Kenesary was denounced at one meeting as "an enemy of the Kazakh toiling masses" by 11 speakers representing the Party leaders and the academic world. The attack was directed at others: school textbook authors Ismailov and Dzhumaliev, both professors of history; Sauranbaev, director of the Social Science Section of the Academy of Sciences; and one Adilgireev, all in addition to Bekmakhanov. But this was only the beginning.

The attack on Kazakh revivalism continued, centered around the figure of Kenesary, with a different series of authors subjected to the sternest criticism. The line now advanced by Pravda, the Party press of Kazakhstan, and the History Section of the Academy of Sciences, was that there were two kinds of leaders in Central Asia in the 18th and 19th centuries—good leaders and bad. The Kazakh leader Kenesary was bad; he was called a class enemy, a reactionary feudal lord. Other Kazakh leaders were classified as good, for they sought to lead their peoples into an alliance with the oppressed Russian masses, seeking a common solution for their jointly shared troubles. The Kazakh leader Isatai Taimanov, for example, revolted not against the Tsar but against Russian capitalists who were exploiting his people.[2] This indicates, the Soviets conclude, that the Tsars had parallel interests with the poor Russians, while the enemies of both the poor Russians and the poor Kazakhs were the Russian capitalists.

The central Soviet historical journal, Voprosy Istorii ("Questions of History"), published in April 1951 a lead editorial, "On Certain

[1] *Pravda*, 26 Dec 50.
[2] *Kazakhstanskaia Pravda*, 19 Apr 51.